DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 906 24 HE 003 225

AUTHOR Brown, Coke R.
TITLE Evaluation of a College Curriculum Advisory Program Utilizing Student Advisors. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Idaho State Univ., Pocatello.
BUREAU NO BR-1-J-052
PUB DATE Jun 72
CONTRACT OEC-X-72-0002(057)
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Counselors; *Educational Guidance; *Faculty Advisors; *Higher Education; *Student Personnel Programs; Student Personnel Work

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to evaluate the viability of using students as academic advisors for freshmen students and to document the process of the advising program at Idaho State University. Results show that students advised by students did as well academically and had a lower dropout rate than students advised by faculty. Descriptions of advisor behaviors and characteristics did not add appreciably to prediction of academic achievement but did predict the students' attitudes toward their advisors. The most outstanding characteristic of the program was the lack of utilization of the advising system by students and the variability in the application of the system. Recommendations for improving the Idaho State University advising system are included. (Author/HS)

Final Report

Project No. 1-J-052
Contract No. OEC-X 72-0002 (057)

Coke R. Brown
Idaho State University
Pocatello, Idaho 83201

EVALUATION OF A COLLEGE CURRICULUM ADVISORY PROGRAM UTILIZING STUDENT ADVISERS

June 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

National Center for Educational Research and Development

(Regional Research Program)

ABSTRACT

In a study designed to evaluate the viability of using students as academic advisers for freshmen students and to document the process of the advising program at Idaho State University, students advised by students did as well academically and had a lower drop out rate when compared to students advised by faculty. Descriptions of adviser behaviors and characteristics did not add appreciably to prediction of academic achievement but did predict the students' attitudes toward their adviser. The most outstanding characteristic of the program was the lack of utilization of the advising system by students and the variability in the application of the system. Recommendations for improving the Idaho State University advising system were also included.

Final Report

Project No. 1-J-052

Contract No. OEC-X-72-0002 (057)

EVALUATION OF A COLLEGE CURRICULUM ADVISORY PROGRAM UTILIZING STUDENT ADVISERS

Coke R. Brown

Idaho State University

Pocatello, Idaho 83201

June 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all those who have cooperated by providing services or information during the course of the study. The staffs of the Counseling Center and Registrar's Office have been most cooperative in making thier records available. The staffs of the Computer Center and CAP Office have been most congenial in providing assistance. Barbara Simpson and Kathy Rasmussen have been extremely patient with the work involved in compiling and editing the various drafts of this report. Finally, Rosemary Myers has been highly supportive, helped with editing, and made valuable suggestions which have improved the final product. kesponsibility for the final product lies with the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Method	3
Subjects and Procedure	3
Assessments	4
Results	6
Reliability of Coding	6
Academic Achievement	6
Prediction of Academic Achievement	7
Differences Between Student Advisers and Faculty Advisers	7
Items Related to the Evaluation of the Adviser	12
Content Analysis of Interviews	14
Additional Information	14
Discussion	16
Academic Achievement	16
Reported Differences Between SAs and FAs	16
Evaluation of the Adviser	17
Evaluation of the Content Analysis	18
Conclusions and Recomendations	20
The System - physical and administrative set up	20
The System - the advisee's point of view	21
The System - the adviser's point of view	21
Paradoxes	22
Recommendations	22
Further Research and Study Effects	23
Suggested Research	23
Bibliography	24
Appendixes	
A.--Assessment Questionnaire	25
B.--Interview Schedule	29
C.--Codes Used to Evaluate Advisee Responses During the Interview	30
D.--Stepwise Regression for Difference between Obtained and Predicted GPA	38
E.--Summary of Responses to Questionnaire: Percent of Student Advised (SA) vs. Percent of Faculty Advised (FA)	39
F.--Summary of Responses to Questionnaire: Percent of Student Advised (SA) vs. Percent of Faculty Advised (FA)	46
G.--Summary of Responses to Questionnaire: Percent Responding in Each Category as a Function of Attitude Toward Adviser	50
H.--Summary of Responses to Questionnaire: Percent Responding in Each Category as a Function of Attitude Toward Adviser	66
I.--Tabulation of Interviewee Comments	71

TABLES

Page

Table 1
Distribution of Incoming Freshman Class 3

Table 2
Distribution of Advisers and Advisees as a Function of the Classification of the Adviser 4

Table 3
Reliability of Coding 6

Table 4
High School and College Grades for Student and Faculty Advised Freshmen 7

Table 5
Percent of Advisees Knowing the Location of Their Adviser's Office (Item 3-E) 8

Table 6
Frequency of Responses to "If I Need to Get in Touch With my Adviser:" - (Item 7-E) 9

Table 7
Frequency of Responses to "In Planning my Fall Schedule, Would you Say:" - (Item 6-E) 9

Table 8
Frequency of Responses to "Would You Say Your Adviser" (Item 9-E) 10

Table 9
Frequency of Responses to "Do You Think Your Adviser:" (Item 10-E) 10

Table 10
Percent Coded in Each Category on Item 27-F (Characterization of Actual Adviser) 11

Table 11
Percent Coded in Each Category on Item 24-F (Attitude Position Toward Advising System) 11

Table 12
Stepwise Regression for Attitude Toward the Adviser (Item 25) 13

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, it has been the responsibility of the faculty of colleges and universities to formulate a program of study for incoming students. Recently, however, faculty-to-student ratios have demanded modification of the traditional advisement relationship. Students at Idaho State University have attempted to provide one answer to increased advising loads by developing a student designed, student administered freshman advising program which grants student advisers equal status with faculty advisers in freshman curriculum advising. A student administered curriculum advising program would seem to be one way of freeing faculty members from freshman advising while, at the same time, providing students the opportunity to become actively involved in the processes of the university.

The Student Curriculum Advising Program (SCAP) has been in operation for three years and most of the administrative and procedural problems have been worked out. SCAP requested that an evaluation of the effectiveness of their program be carried out. These students were interested in both the long and short range effects of the program and, in addition, wanted to obtain a better understanding of the factors involved in successful curriculum advising. The short range effects and evaluation of students' perceptions of the advising ralationship were obtained in the present study while long range effects will be evaluated under institutional funds granted on a regular basis.

In order to evaluate the program it was necessary to first have a clear idea of the purposes and goals of the program and a knowledge of the means used to accomplish same. A further requirement of such an evaluation was that there be one or more criteria of effectiveness with which to compare the program.

The stated purpose of curriculum advising at Idaho State University is to insure that students have access to information concerning curriculum requirements, advice as to the course(s) of study to follow, and information concerning general university facilities and academic requirements. Curriculum advisers are not expected to serve as counselor, lay priest, or watch dog. They do, however, serve as a referral source for such facilities as counseling (through a counseling center staffed by qualified counselors), tutoring services, campus medical facilities, etc. The curriculum adviser does not dictate to students, but rather, advises. Thus, the only reasonable criterion for evaluating the effectiveness of a curriculum adviser is the success with which his advisees proceed through the academic community. In the present study student adviser effectiveness was relative to that of faculty serving as advisers.

Since the present study did not attempt to examine all of the possible hypotheses concerning the effectiveness of curriculum advising, the focus of the present study should be clarified and the range of questions to be dealt with outlined. The major purpose of this study was to determine whether or not curriculum advising carried out by selected students is as effective as curriculum advising administered by faculty in general. To the point, "Is the use of students as curriculum advisers a viable alternative to faculty curriculum advising at the freshman level?"

The basic question might be most easily answered by simply comparing the academic success of students advised by faculty with students advised by students using multiple regression techniques to control for differences in academic ability. However, SCAP also wanted to know what factors contribute to effective advising. Therefore, the present study was designed to document both the behaviors and perceptions of students' advisees and the relationship of these to the objective characteristics of advisers and the effectiveness of the advising.

In reviewing the research on curriculum advising programs which used students as advisers and/or used academic achievement as a criterion of the effectiveness of advising, we found that very little research had been done. The one program which had been evaluated and approximated SCAP was reported by Lynch (1970). The program studied by Lynch used female student advisers who resided in the same dorm with advisees and who served as "group" leaders in that they also served in non-curriculum advising capacities and maintained extensive contact with their advisees. Lynch's findings are reported in terms of the correlations of various indices with ratings of these advisers. Although the study does not compare types of advisers, her findings do bear on the present effort in that she found a significant correlation between over-all rating of the advisers and the advisees adjusted (for ability) GPAs.

The majority of studies encountered in reviewing the literature dealt with students as counselors (see Anderson, 1972 for a current review) or with special faculty groups. Most of this research indicates that students could be effective counselors with a minimum of supervision and training. Zunker and Brown (1966) studied students given 50 hours of training and paid $15 a week to provide academic counseling for freshmen. Students counseled by students in this study received better grades than those students who were counseled by professional counselors. Rossman (1967, 1968) found that faculty given release time for advising did not seem to improve academic achievement for their advisees when compared to other faculty. Morehead and Johnson (1964) found, for faculty advised students, that more required contacts resulted in better academic performance for advisees. Juola, Winburne, & Whitmore (1968) reported that students who were on probation who voluntarily came in for special advising and were advised to take easier courses did better than probationary students who did not come in for such advising. Finally, Sander (1964) failed to find differences in academic achievement between students who were given different amounts of advising by dorm advisers.

In general, then, there was little prior research to guide the present study and little in the way of consistent evidence to serve as a guide for the present research. There was a suggestion from the literature that students might be more effective than faculty and contradictory evidence concerning the effectiveness of increasing the number of required contacts between adviser and advisee.

METHOD

Subjects and Procedure

In the 1970-71 academic year, 1,121 incoming freshmen students enrolled at Idaho State University. An informal estimate was made by the Registrar and the Curriculum Advising Office that about 1,200 freshmen students would enroll for the 1971-72 academic year. However, only 980 entering freshmen did enroll. The distribution of these students in terms of their availability for use in the present study is summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Distribution of Incoming Freshman Class: Fall, 1971

Students available for study	Control	160
	Interviews	223
	Others:	
	Refusals	11
	Unreachables*	82
	Dropped	47
	Total	523
Students not available for study because of special advising assignments.	Nursing	49
	Athletics	12
	C.A.P. Director	17
	Unadvised	12
	Special services for disadvantaged students	52
	Administrators and first-year faculty	315
	Total	457
Total		980

*Students who could not be reached by telephone and who did not respond to a letter requesting them to contact the interviewer.

The C.A.P. Office supplied for the present study a list of advisers and their advisees. The advisers were selected according to their academic rank as determined by the University Bulletin. From each rank, the advisees were randomly selected and placed into a control group and an interview group. Table 2 summarizes the distribution of advisees and advisers in each adviser category.

TABLE 2

Distribution of Advisers and Advisees as a Function of the Classification of the Adviser

	Number of Advisers	Number of Control Advisees	Number of Advisees Available for Interview	Number of Advisees Interviewed
Student	40	71	141	74
Instructor	29	26	60	40
Assistant Professor	42	40	70	42
Associate Professor	33	23	53	40
Full Professor	13	0	37	27
Totals	157	160	363	223

The names of the advisees available for interviewing were given code numbers, representing type of adviser, to insure a double-blind situation. The advisees names, with code numbers, were given to the interviewer and the interviewer then contacted the advisees and made scheduled appointments with them.

During the interview session (see Appendix B), the advisees were interviewed in the following manner. Advisees either came to an interview room on campus or the interviewer met them at a location convenient for the advisee. When contact was made, the interviewer explained that the purpose of the study was to find out more about the advising process so that advisers would be able to do a better job of advising. The interviewer informed the advisees that they would be identified by number only, and that the interview would be taped. After completing the interview the advisee filled out the questionnaire. (In approximately five cases, the advisees filled out the questionnaire prior to the interview. This was done to accommodate advisees who were waiting while another interview was in progress.)

Assessments

The present study relied on high school grades[1] as the best single predictor of college grades, since research conducted by ETS has indicated that this is the best single predictor at ISU and that other factors (including ACT scores) do not appreciably improve prediction. College GPAs were obtained from university records for the fall semester.

[1]As reported to ETS

In addition to GPA information, advisees filled out a questionnaire (see Appendix A) and responded to questions in a tape recorded interview (see Appendixes B and C respectively for the interview schedule and codes). The tape recorded interviews were also analyzed for content by noting advisees' comments about the advising systems and their suggestions for change.

All advisers were requested by the CAP Office to provide information concerning contacts with each advisee two weeks after registration and two weeks before finals.

RESULTS[1]

Reliability of Coding

The reliabilities for Items 21-C, 23-C, 25-C, and 27-C were acceptable; for Item 24-C the reliability was marginally acceptable; and for Items 22-C, 20-C, and 26-C the reliabilities were below generally accepted standards.

TABLE 3

Reliability of Coding

Item	Description	Reliability
25	Attitude Position - Adviser	r = .863 N = 45
27	Characterization of Actual Adviser	r = .893 N = 45
21	Position Involvement - Adviser	r = .773 N = 45
24	Attitude Position - Advising	r = .619 r = .652* N = 45
22	Position Involvement - Advising System	r = .395 N = 45
20	Issue Involvement	67% agreement** N = 45
23	Situational Involvement	84% agreement** N = 45
26	Characterization of Ideal Adviser	66% agreement** N = 44

*r = .652 represents a correlation based on collapsed categories. Categories one through four were collapsed into a single category, and categories six and seven were collapsed into a single category. The collapsing was necessary for some subsequent chi-square analyses due to the low frequencies in some of the categories.

**Most subjects were coded within a single category and thus reliability is best described in terms of percent of agreement.

Academic Achievement

Two assessments of the effect of the adviser on academic achievement were made in the present study: GPA adjusted for ability and

[1]Comparisons reported in the text are significant ($p < .05$) unless otherwise noted. For statistical values, data breakdown, and degrees of freedom, refer to the item designated by number and letter. The number indicates item placement in the questionnaire or coding and the letter indicates which appendix is most relevant to the comparison cited in the text.

drop-out rate. Examination of Table 4 reveals that there was slightly less difference between high school and college GPA for advisees advised by SAs than for those advised by FAs. This difference is not statistically reliable (analysis of covariance F = 0, df = 1,315) and what difference there is favors the advisees with SAs. There was no reliable difference in high school grades (t = .56, df = 325) or college grades (t = .32, df = 378) considered separately.

TABLE 4

High School and College Grades for Student and Faculty Advised Freshmen*

	Student Advised (N = 11?)	Faculty Advised (N = 201)
1st Semester College GPA	$\bar{X}$ = 2.17 SD = .916	$\bar{X}$ = 2.28 SD = .979
High School GPA	$\bar{X}$ = 2.64 SD = .605	$\bar{X}$ = 2.80 SD = .676

*Includes all interviewed and control advisees for whom high school GPAs were available.

The alternative assessment of academic achievement, drop-out rate, yields a statistically reliable difference between student advised and faculty advised groups with the latter group exhibiting a higher drop rate (X^2 = 5.306, df = 1, p < .05). Only 10 of the 194 advisees with SAs dropped from school while 37 of the 318 advised by FAs dropped.

Prediction of academic achievement

Two regression analyses, one using college GPA for the first semester and one using the difference between high school and college GPA as the dependent variable, were conducted. In the first analysis only high school GPA and sex of student accounted for significant portions of the variance. In the second analysis, two variables account for significant portions of the variability of the difference between high school and college GPAs (see Appendix D). Students who are likely to see their advisers for a schedule change but not likely to see them in case of a conflict with an instructor achieve higher grades relative to high school performance. Though these items do account for a statistically significant portion of the variance; in absolute terms, less than 10% of the variance is accounted for and the two items would seem to reflect advisee characteristics.

Differences Between Student Advisers and Faculty Advisers

The most outstanding difference between student advisers (SAs) and faculty advisers (FAs) is a difference in sex composition (Item 2-E).

Sixty-seven percent of the students advised by SAs were advised by females while only twenty-six percent of those advised by FAs were advised by females. This difference is so striking that it was deemed necessary to look at sex of adviser differences, as well as classification of adviser differences, since any differences observed between SAs and FAs might simply have reflected the reactions to sex of adviser. Whenever comparisons indicated a significant difference between SAs and FAs, these groups were sub-divided into male SAs, female SAs, male FAs, and female FAs and re-analysed in order to pinpoint the source of the difference. This second group of analyses is reported only for those items on which sex-adviser classification was the source of the observed adviser difference.

Students were more likely to know the location of their adviser's office if the adviser was a faculty member (Item 3-E). This difference is due to the fact that students advised by female SAs were much less likely to know the location of their adviser's office than students with other types of advisers.

TABLE 5

Percent of Advisees Knowing the Location of Their Adviser's Office (Item 3-E)

	Male SAs	Female SAs	Male FAs	Female FAs
%	93	77	97	97
n	29	48	110	39

This lack of knowledge concerning office location did not, however, seem to effect the likelihood of the advisee making contact with his adviser. There was no significant difference between SA and FA advisees in terms of the number of times they reported having seen their advisers and what difference there was favored the SAs (Item 4-F). In addition, there is a significant difference between SAs and FAs in terms of the reported ease of contact, SAs being easier to contact than FAs (Item 7-E).

TABLE 6

Frequency of Responses to "If I Need to Get in Touch With my Adviser:" - Item 7-E

Response	% Advised by SAs	% Advised by FAs
I know when and where to find him	62.5	36.0
I can get in touch with him if I make an appointment	16.0	30.0
I can reach him after two or three attempts	14.5	20.5
I find it almost impossible to get hold of him	7.0	13.5
Total	100.0	100.0

In terms of students' reports of what went on in the advising session, SAs were more likely to discuss a student's schedule with the student while FAs were more likely to expect the student to figure our his own schedule (Item 6-E).

TABLE 7

Frequency of Responses to "In Planning my Fall Schedule, Would you Say:" - Item 6-E

Response	SAs	FAs
My adviser planned my schedule for me	5.5	6.5
I discussed my schedule with my adviser and he talked me into taking the courses that I enrolled in	10.0	11.0
I discussed my schedule with my adviser but he left the final decisions up to me	71.5	50.0
My adviser expected me to plan my own schedule	13.0	32.5
Total	100.0	100.0

In addition, students more often reported an increase in understanding of curriculum matters and enrollment procedures when advised by SAs than when advised by FAs (Item 9-E).

TAELE 8

Frequency of Responses to "Would You Say Your Adviser" - Item 9-E

	%SAs	%FAs
Increased your understanding of curriculum matters and enrollment procedures	53.0	33.5
Did not provide much information which I had not already gotten from other sources	43.0	61.0
Needlessly made things appear to be more complicated than they are	4.0	5.5
Total	100.0	100.0

In answer to the question "Did your adviser give you any advice on how to get through registration?", those advised by SAs said yes 59% of the time while those advised by FAs said yes only 28.0% of the time (Item 12-E).

In addition to differences in the way SAs and FAs were seen as behaving, there were distinctive differences in the way the advisers were evaluated and this in turn seemed to effect the advisees' attitudes toward the advising system. SAs were seen as more interested in advising (Item 10-E).

TABLE 9

Frequency of Responses to "Do You Think Your Adviser:" - Item 10-E

	%SAs	%FAs
Is very interested in advising and helping freshmen students	41.5	25.0
Is somewhat interested in advising and helping freshmen students	37.0	35.5
Is not particularly interested in advising and helping freshmen	18.5	38.0
Dislikes having to advise freshmen	3.0	1.5
Total	100.0	100.0

SAs were characterized as being more friendly and interested than were FAs in the interviews (Item 27-F). This difference reflects a relatively positive evaluation of female SAs and negative evaluation of male FAs.

TABLE 10

Percent Coded in each Category on Item 27-F
(Characterization of Actual Adviser)

	%SAs	%FAs
Counselor	5.5	4.5
Concerned Friend	69.5	40.0
Administrator	16.5	29.5
Formality	8.5	26.0
Total	100.0	100.0

Students advised by SAs had more positive views of the advising system than did those advised by FAs (Item 24-F).

TABLE 11

Percent Coded in Each Category on Item 24-F
(Attitude Position Toward Advising System)

	%SAs	%FAs
Against the System	0.0	3.5
Against With Minor Reservations	4.0	7.0
Against With Major Reservations	4.0	14.5
Neutral (Ambivalent)	1.5	7.5
For With Major Reservations	32.0	19.0
For With Minor Reservations	43.0	41.0
For the System	15.5	8.0
Total	100.0	100.5

On those measures which did not yield a statistically reliable difference ($p < .05$) the trend is in the same direction indicated by the reliable differences. Students contacted SAs more often (Item 4-E, $p < .10$), were more likely to report having informal contacts with SAs (33% to 28%, Item 5-E), saw their advisers as having been more friendly when advised by SAs (Item 8-E, $p < .10$), and were more likely to report that their adviser discussed general requirements with them (Item 11-E, $p < .10$) when advised by SAs. SAs were more often reported to have answered all of the advisee's questions (78% to 68%, Item 13-E), were more likely to report increased confidence in their roles as students following the advising session (55% to 48%, Item 19-E), and gave more positive evaluations of their advisers (Item 25-E, $p < .10$).

The only questionnaire items on which the students did not compare favorably with the faculty as advisers were on estimates of the likelihood of the student contacting the adviser under various circumstances (Items 14-E, 15-E, 16-E, 17-E, and 18-E). None of the differences was statistically reliable and the most notable feature of these items is the infrequency with which students would contact advisers of any type for any purpose. Only 27-30% of those advised by either type of adviser say they definitely would see their adviser for a schedule change--something they are required to do by university regulations.

Items Related to the Evaluation of the Adviser

The present study approaches the problem of identifying those advisers who are positively evaluated by their advisees in two different ways. The first approach was a multiple regression analysis (see Table 12) using attitude toward the adviser as the dependent variable and the second was a series of X^2 analyses (see Appendixes G & H). Results of the two approaches are comparable but the X^2 analyses provide individual tests of significance while the multiple regression approach is directed at prediction (assuming ordinal response categories) and thus does not provide individual estimates for variables with over-lapping variance.

Six variables in the present study are significantly related to the evaluation of the adviser and contribute to a significant degree to the prediction of evaluation of the adviser. Advisees who positively evaluate their adviser are more likely to characterize their adviser as friendly (Item 8-G, $r = -.673$), are more likely to report an increase in understanding of curriculum and enrollment following the advising session (Item 9-G, $r = .610$), are more likely to have a positive view of the advising system (Item 24-I, $r = .471$), are more likely to report that the adviser discussed general university requirements with them (Item 11-G, $r = .431$), are likely to report that the adviser seems interested in discussing general requirements (Item 10-G, $r = .574$), and are more prone to see their adviser for a schedule change (Item 14-G, $r = .414$).

One additional variable contributes significantly to the multiple correlation but is not significant by X^2 comparison. The sex of the advisee is predictive of the evaluation which the adviser will receive, males giving more positive evaluations than females (Item 1-G, $r = -.175$).

TABLE 12

Stepwise Regression for Attitude Toward the Adviser (Item 25)[1,2]

Item	Description	Multiple Regression	Correlation With Dependent Variable	Significance Level for Multiple Regression ($p < .05$)	Significance Level for Additional Variance Accounted for ($p < .05$)
8-G	Characterization of Adviser	.673	.673	*	*
9-G	Report of Effect of Adviser on Understanding	.736	-.610	*	*
24-H	Attitude Toward the System	.769	.471	*	*
11-G	Discussion of General Requirements	.783	.431	*	*
8-G	Friendliness of Adviser	.795	-.574	*	*
1-G	Sex of Advisee	.806	-.175	*	*
14-G	Likelihood of Seeing for Schedule Change	.813	-.414	*	*

[1]Variables not presented contribute less than .01 to multiple regression.

[2]n = 189.

These variables yield a multiple correlation of .813. The remaining variables increase the multiple correlation only slightly; bringing the figure to .825. Both figures are highly significant and approach the reliability of the measure (r = .863).

Ten additional items related ($p < .05$ by X^2) to the advisee's positive evaluation of his adviser: Having informal contact with the adviser (Item 5-G) reporting that the adviser discussed the class schedule rather than telling the student to fill out his own schedule (Item 6-G), ease of contact (Item 7-G), the adviser's apparent interest in advising freshmen (Item 10-G), the adviser's having answered all the advisee's questions (Item 13-G), the likelihood of going to the adviser under any of the circumstances noted in itsms 14-G, 16-G, 17-G, and 18-G (note that few of the advisees are likely to see their adviser about a friend's drug problem), reported confidence following the advising session (Item 19-G), advisee's issue involvement during the interview (Item 20-H), and the advisee's position involvement in his attitude toward the adviser (Item 21-H).

Content analysis of interviews

Comments made frequently (10 or more times) during the interviews are tabulated in Appendix I and will be discussed in conjunction with other findings in a later section.

Additional information

The design of the present study included the collection of advisers' reports of their contacts with students as well as reports from students. However, the low return rate on the questionnaires indicated that the data would best reflect the behavior of advisers and would not serve as a good indication of the congruence of adviser-advisee perceptions of the amount of contact. The fact that most of the interviews (59%) were conducted after advisers returned the questionnaires further reduced the comparability of the adviser and advisee reports on contact.

The initial questionnaire asked the adviser to report whether he saw each assigned advisee at the "Meet Your Adviser" session and for an individual advising session prior to registration. Of the student advisers, 41 of 49 returned the questionnaire to the CAP Office[1]; while 104 of 154 faculty advisers available for use in the present study returned questionnaires ($X^2 = 3.987$, df = 1, $p < .05$). On the second questionnaire inquiring about the number of contacts during the first semester, 19 of 49 student advisers and 40 of 154 faculty advisers returned the questionnaires ($X^2 = 2.368$, df = 1).

One additional source of information, which could be relevant to evaluation of differences between SAs and FAs, was a list supplied by the CAP Office indicating the number of advisees for each faculty adviser on campus. Student advisers had an average of 6.43 (SD = 2.297) advisees,

[1]Curriculum Advising Program is in charge of assigning advisers for freshman students and students who have not declared a major.

most of whom were freshmen. The faculty advisers available for the present study had an average of 3.76 (SD = 3.37) freshman advisees and an average of 19.09 (SD = 13.688) total advisees. Figures for faculty used in the study are comparable to the figures for the faculty as a whole.

The most prominant feature of the figures on advising loads is the variability of the size of the loads. The figures exclude first year faculty who are generally not assigned advisees or are assigned a minimal number of advisees. The variability in advising loads also characterizes differences in administrative units on campus with two departments having average advising loads (excluding first year faculty) of six advisees per faculty member while one college on campus (Business) averages 46.71 total advisees (including first year faculty.)

DISCUSSION

Academic Achievement

Students advised by SAs started with a lower predicted level of academic achievement but achieved at a comparative level commensurate with their abilities. In addition, these students were less likely to drop out of school. It is clear that student advisers are at least as effective as faculty advisers in aiding the student's academic achievement during the first semester of the student's freshman year. The finding relative to academic achievement could even be interpreted as suggesting that students are better off academically if advised by SAs. However, it must be recognized that there may be instances when a student should be advised to drop from school and thus short term drop rate is of questionable validity.

The study does not provide any clear indication of the reason for the advantage enjoyed by students advised by SAs but experience in the academic setting and research on students as counselors suggest several possibilities. SAs are in a position to suggest specific courses and/or instructors without suffering the constraint imposed on faculty by peer pressure and academic integrity. Students may feel free to ask questions of peers that they would not ask of faculty. Finally, SAs may have a better understanding of the concerns and interests of students. Regardless of the reason for the observed differences, it is clear that, regarding the most critical bases for evaluating the effectiveness of advisers, SAs are a viable alternative to faculty advising.

Reported Differences Between SAs and FAs

Even though students are less likely to be able to list an office location for SAs, they perceive SAs as being easier to get in touch with when they need them. A number of factors enter into a consideration of this difference.

Many students have classes with their SAs or see them regularly on the campus and have a good idea of when and where to find them. Also, many students, particularly females, live in the same dorm with their SAs and thus are afforded convenient access to their advisers.

On the other hand, many students complain of faculty not posting office hours and failing to keep appointments. Though it was not speifically noted in the coding or content analysis, both coders and the interviewer noted that a number of students indicated that they did not make appointments with their advisers but, instead, would just drop by the advisers' offices at their own convenience--often failing to find the adviser in his office on such occasions. It should also be noted that contacting the faculty adviser often requires the student to go out of his way to reach, what may be for him, an inconvenient location at at inconvenient time.

Students advised by SAs were more likely to indicate that the adviser discussed their schedules with them rather than simply telling them to fill out their own schedules. A large part of this difference may well be due to the fact that the SAs are volunteer advisers. Many

faculty have expressed the sentiment that "Students who cannot read the Bulletin should not be in college." Students who share this "student responsibility" point of view would seem to be unlikely to volunteer as a student adviser.

The fact that students report a greater understanding of the university and enrollment procedures when advised by SAs is probably due to SAs' more recent experience with the mysteries of the college bulletin and the confusion which entering freshmen often express. It seems quite probable that students would also be willing to ask "dumb," mundane, or non-academic questions of SAs that they would be reluctant to ask of FAs.

In terms of SAs being more likely to discuss the registration process and how to get through it, it would seem that SAs are probably all too aware of the potential hassels involved in registration. Since registration procedures often vary from campus to campus, it is likely that many faculty are not aware of the problems which are likely to crop up in the registration process of a university which they did not attend as a student.

The SAs apparent greater interest in advising freshmen students probably reflects the volunteer status of SAs. This is further reflected in the fact that FAs are more likely to be perceived as advisers-under-duress who would rather not advise and who see themselves as fulfilling a job requirement. The more positive evaluation of the advising system given by students advised by SAs probably reflects better treatment by the system and more perceived gains.

Evaluation of the Adviser

The interpretation of $\underline{X}^2$ and correlational data is somewhat a hazardous undertaking in that it is tempting to infer cause and effect relationships on the basis of evidence represented by these statistics. The items related to a positive evaluation of the adviser in the present study fall into three categories: Relationships which seem to reflect the effects of having a positively evaluated adviser; relationships which seem to reflect characteristics of the advisees; and relationships which seem to reflect the behaviors of the advisers which lead to a positive evaluation.

Having an adviser who is liked seems to increase the probability that the student will have a positive view of the advising system, to increase the likelihood of his seeing his adviser in any of the hypothetical situations in the questionnaire (except the case of a friend with a drug problem), to increase the probability of informal contacts between adviser and advisee, to increase the student's confidence in his role as a student, and to result in less concern on the part of the student about curriculum advising. The increase in involvement in the evaluation of the adviser varies as a function of the extremity of the evaluation and would seem to be confounded with the coding of the attitude toward the adviser.

The sex of the student is the only student characteristic which seems to effect the evaluation of the adviser with males being more

likely to give a positive evaluation. This is somewhat contrary to the author's preconceptions but is not of great importance in relation to the present study.

The adviser who is positively evaluated is perceived to be more friendly, more interested in advising, and easier to reach when the student needs advice. He also seems to provide more information to the student since students report the adviser increased their understanding of university requirements; he seems to discuss general university requirements; he seems to be more effective in answering questions which the students pose; and he is more likely to discuss the student's schedule (and presumably academic goals) instead of telling the student to figure out his own schedule.

In general, it would seem that students appreciate those services which advisers are supposed to provide and, in turn, appreciate advisers who are willing to provide the services. Advisers who do not provide the services are resented.

One somewhat distrubing factor in the results of the present study is the fact that, though students indicate that they are more likely to see advisers they like, there is no significant relationship between how well the adviser is liked and the number of times that the student reports having contacted the adviser. This point will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

Evaluation of the Content Analysis

Comments concerning advising and the advising system were not tabulated as a function of adviser type and thus do not reflect differences between types of advisers. The tabulations (see Appendix I) represent the observations, by the coders, of the factors which were mentioned often enough to be deemed worthy of closer examination. The comments would seem to fall into three general categories: comments concerning how advisers should behave or what they should do; comments concerning student evaluations of the advising system and the extent to which they use the system; and comments recommending changes in the system, services, or administration of the system.

Students seem to feel that there is a need for the adviser to take an active interest in each advisee. Fifteen percent made this suggestion explicitly during the course of the interview. Thirteen percent express a need for more directive advising and 21% indicate that there should be more required contacts between advisees and advisers. The context in which these comments were generally made suggests to the coders that many freshman students would like to be told what to do and when to do it.

An equally large group seem to feel much the same way that some faculty members feel about advising. Eighteen percent specifically say that advising should deal strictly with matters of curriculum and this was generally in the context of arguing that advisers should not have to nurse-maid freshmen.

The fact that 41% specifically mention that advisers should know and explain academic requirements seem to reflect the fact that most

students do understand the major reason for having advisers; but the fact that 26% expect advisers to be able to discuss course content in outside areas and to tell them which instructors to take and which to avoid would seem to reflect a failure to appreciate the role of the faculty adviser.

Students' reactions to the system were generally positive in the over-all evaluation but are less positive in terms of specifics. Twenty-nine percent indicate that the advising system is a "good deal" or a "good idea" but that the system often fails to be effective because some advisers do not do their jobs. Twenty-six percent complained about the fact that their advisers (generally faculty) did not post office hours, 18% (a very conservative estimate) indicated that most of their friends did not go to see their advisers, and 12% indicated in no uncertain terms that they had no intention of ever seeing their advisers again. Twenty-eight percent indicated that they did not think the advising system of any particular importance for students but most qualified this by recognizing that the system is serving a purpose during the first few weeks that the student is on campus. These students generally indicated that most students are capable of using the Bulletin and are familiar with campus facilities after this time and thus have little use for an adviser. Twelve percent complained that their advisers had failed to keep scheduled appointments.

Only three recommendations for changes in the administration of the advising system were mentioned with any notable frequency. Ten percent suggested reduced advising loads. In most cases this suggestion was made by a student who had literally had to wait in line to get in to see his adviser for approval of his first semester schedule. Twenty-four percent suggested that advisers should be qualified to provide vocational guidance for students. This finding suggests that advisers are not doing an effective job of making students aware of the services available through the counseling center on campus.

The third recommendation made with some frequency was that student advisers should be upperclassmen rather than sophomores (mentioned 20% of the time). This suggests that an age-experience factor might enter into students'evaluations of their advisers. However, all of the significant differences between Sas and FAs were broken down by adviser classification within faculty and no consistent ordering of the faculty classifications was present. In fact, the outstanding characteristic of the data when looked at in this manner was the fact that SAs were perceived in essentially the same way that full professors were seen. Given the differences observed in the study, perhaps it might be more appropriate to say that full professors were seen as being more like the student advisers than like other faculty advisers. If these two groups had been combined (SAs and full professors) almost every item in the study would distinguish them from the other three groups (instructors, assistants, and associates) combined.

It should be noted that these observations concerning differences within the faculty classifications are not meant to imply that there are no differences between these classifications, since indeed there were several items which distinguished between these groups. The ordering of the groups was, however, not consistent--with the general exception that full professors were rated in much the same way as SAs.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The primary goal of the present study was to assess the viability of the use of students as curriculum advisers for incoming freshmen. Evidence from the present study suggests no reason why students should not be employed in this capacity. Rather, it would appear that students might be a preferred alternative to faculty for most advisees.

The second goal of the present study was to gain information about advising and the advising process. The most outstanding finding in this regard is that very little actual advising takes place. Students seldom contact their advisers.

In attempting to evaluate this information, it is necessary to go beyond the data collected in the present study and look at the structure of the advising process from as many angles as possible.

The system - physical and administrative set-up

The Curriculum Advising Program Office is located on the third floor of the administration building. This location is not central to student traffic patterns and the student traffic that does go into this building goes primarily to the Registrar's Office located in the basement. Contact with the CAP Office is generally by mail and direct contact with students has decreased (informal estimate from CAP director) since the office was moved from the basement of the administration building to the third floor two years ago.

Administratively, CAP is run by a director who teaches one course each semester in addition to directing the advising program. The activities of the CAP are guided and monitored by a faculty-student advisory committee. Final responsibility for pre-major advising is in the office of the Academic Vice-President. CAP (and thus SCAP) serves as an information source for students, handles the administrative chores of assigning advisees, and provides a service to departments on campus by channeling students to the appropriate departments.

CAP has responsibility for the assignment of advisers for freshmen students and all students who have not officially declared a major. However, since the declaration of major procedure is only loosely followed at ISU, many upper-division students remain in the CAP program long after they have settled on a major.

The SCAP program is a student administered division of the CAP program and is under the supervision of the CAP director. The role of SCAP advisers, however, is somewhat different than that of advisers in the CAP program since the student advisers generally are oriented toward providing a necessary service for students and, with few exceptions, advise freshmen students only. SCAP advisers are also supervised and given fairly rigorous training while CAP (faculty) advisers are much less subject to supervision, are not volunteers, and may not bother to attend adviser training sessions conducted by CAP.

The system - the advisee's point of view

The system, from the advisee's point of view, varies to some degree from observer to observer. Different advisees want different things from the system and thus an overall picture will not fairly represent some advisees. There are, however, some facts which are generally applicable. Students express a need for the system and its services even though they may not use the services and they may see the system as being of value during the initial portion of the beginning semester only. Students' major complaints center around the difficulty of using the system. They complain about the inadequacy of some advisers, the difficulty of making contact with advisers, and the lack of vocational guidance.

Students also seem to be unaware of many of the available services and their freedom of choice in regard to the advising system. They do not seem to get the message that vocational guidance is available from trained personnel and they do not seem to realize that they can change advisers at their (the student's) discretion. In some cases the student may be aware of his adviser option but is fearful of reprisal from faculty members since he may have to take a course from the adviser at some later date.

The primary value of the system to the freshman student is that the system offers him an opportunity to meet faculty and to have many of his anxieties concerning his new role alleviated. He sees the advising system as an agent for gently easing him into the new role and familiarizing him with the rules and regulations associated with the new role. He does not go to his adviser very often after the initial meetings. He sometimes views the system as an establishment hassel and he often forges the adviser's signature for registration or schedule changes.

The system - the adviser's point of view

The fact that student advisers are volunteers who are screened to insure that they are interested in providing a service would indicate that most SAs are indeed service oriented as advisers. FAs (and administrators) are required to serve as advisers in the CAP program and do not seem to be so uniformly motivated. Some are interested in providing a service to the student. Some are interested in upper-division (non-CAP) advising only. Some see advising as an opportunity to recruit majors. Some see the system as a necessary evil and still others see time spent advising freshmen as time which could be more profitably employed in other activities.

FAs also vary greatly in the way they handle their advisees. Some explicitly require advisees to see them at specified times, or to come in if the advisee has certain problems, and some leave the timing and number of contacts up to the advisee.

Advisers view their responsibilities differently. Some do not accept any responsibility other than answering curriculum questions and handle this by sending the student to the Bulletin. Others see themselves as being responsible, to varying degrees, for informing the student of his academic progress and pointing out the implications of the student's choices.

Implicit within the system (but a point of view the author has not heard directly expressed by any adviser) is the adviser as an individual who is somehow responsible for seeing that the student takes courses which are required. This latter view would seem to place the responsibility on the adviser of going beyond the role of advising the student to the role of directing and planning a student's curriculum and somehow forcing the student to stick to that curriculum. Some advisers take the position that this is the student's responsibility--not the adviser's.

Paradoxes

1. Students see the system as a needed service, suggest that advisers be more directive and require more contacts, and generally give positive evaluations of their advisers--but they don't see their advisers even when ISU regulations require that they do so. The small number of average contacts (the distribution is skewed toward the high contact end.) indicates a widespread violation of regulations pertaining to advising contacts and suggests that most advisers either do not or cannot enforce the regulations.

2. The CAP Office serves as a central advising agency but is not centrally located relative to student traffic patterns.

3. The CAP program is set up to advise pre-majors and general studies students. These are students who may be uncertain of a career choice or students who are fulfilling basic university requirements prior to declaring a major. Yet, the program is poorly coordinated with vocational guidance services and fails to make full use of faculty in departments with small enrollments.

4. The program is characterized as a student service but policy decisions often reflect a greater concern for faculty, department, or administration considerations. Faculty are required to serve as advisers even though some must not be doing a very good job. By requiring faculty to serve as advisers student-faculty contact can be encouraged, faculty can be forced to be aware of general requirements, and faculty can be treated in an unbiased manner (everyone has to advise freshmen!). However, none of these considerations indicates an interest in the quality of the services provided.

Recommendations

The advising system at ISU might be improved by considering any or all of the suggestions which follow.

1. The CAP program should be structured so as to provide a student service. The program should be set up for this purpose administratively and decisions concerning the operation should be predicated on serving the student effectively and realistically.

2. Advisers should serve freshmen on a voluntary basis or the advising process should be more carefully monitored to insure that services are provided.

3. The advising process should be more closely coordinated with the counseling center and its services.

4. The central advising office should be located so as to provide convenient access for students.

5. Adviser assignments within the CAP program should be on a one year basis. This would allow students an opportunity to change advisers without prejudice and would encourage the student to declare a major in order to be assigned outside the general advising program.

6. The responsibility for selection of curriculum should be placed explicitly on the student or the adviser and the responsibility of each should be clearly outlined. If responsibility is to be placed on faculty, there must be some means available for the faculty member to enforce his decisions.

7. Alternatives such as a central advising system should be explored.

Further research and study effects

Data obtained in the present study will be supplemented with continuous GPA data over the next three years and a questionnaire will be sent to students in the present study during the second semester of their fourth year. The data from the present study will also be used as a basis for providing preliminary answers to questions not specifically investigated in the planned analyses. The first such "question" will be to investigate the possible effects of the size of advising load the adviser carries.

Personnel in the CAP Office have become more cognizant of the need for a solid data base on which to make decisions. Consequently, traffic through the CAP Office will be monitored to determine which services are not used. The CAP Office also plans to consult with personnel in the counseling center so that services can be better coordinated, to explore the feasibility of consolidating counseling and advising programs on campus, and to explore ways of more effectively publicizing services.

Suggested Research

1. A more systematic exploration of faculty attitudes and knowledge in relation to advising should be conducted.

2. A survey of student registration and scheduling problems should be conducted and a listing of these problems, accompanied by suggestions for avoiding them, should be made available to students and advisers.

3. The feasibility of developing a flow chart for advising should be investigated. Such a algorithm might enable students to effectively and systematically deal with most of the more mundane advising problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, J. C. An examination of peer counseling: should non-professionals counsel? Paper presented to the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Pocatello, Idaho, May, 1972.

Juola, A. E., Winburne, J. W., & Whitmore, A. Computer-assisted academic advising. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 47, 146-150.

Lynch, T. H. Perception of peer leadership influence. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 203-205.

Morehead, C. G., & Johnson, J. C. Some effects of a faculty advising program. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 43, 139-144.

Rossmann, J. E. An experimental study of faculty advising. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 46, 160-163.

Rossmann, J. E. Released time for faculty advising: the impact upon freshmen. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 47, 358-363.

Sander, D. L. Experimental educational advising in men's residence halls. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 42, 787-790.

Zunker, V. G. & Brown, W. F. Comparative effectiveness of student and professional counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 738-743.

APPENDIX A

ADVISEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Code Number _____ Sex: M___ F___ (Item 1)

Date _____ Sex of Adviser: M___ F___ (Item 2)

Age _____ Intended Major_____

The location of my adviser's office is (Item 3)_____

I have had (Item 4) curriculum advising contacts with my adviser. (Please include the "Meet Your Adviser" session if attended and do not include contact with your adviser in which you did not seek curriculum advice).

Have you had any informal visits with your adviser? Yes__No__(Item 5)

Not sure__ (Please explain)_____

_____

In planning your fall schedule, would you say: (check one only)(Item 6)

___My adviser planned my schedule for me.

___I discussed my schedule with my adviser and he talked me into taking the course that I enrolled in.

___I discussed my schedule with my adviser but he left the final decision up to me.

___My adviser expected me to plan my own schedule.

If none of the above alternatives fits your case, please explain_____

_____

If I need to get in touch with my adviser: (check one only)(Item 7)

___I know when and where to find him.

___I can get in touch with him if I make an appointment.

___I can reach him after two or three attempts.

___I find it almost impossible to get hold of him.

If none of the above alternatives fits your case, please explain_____

_____

_____

In your individual advising session, would you say your adviser was: (Item 8)

___Very friendly.

___Friendly.

___Neither particularly friendly or unfriendly.

___Unfriendly or distant.

___Very unfriendly or distant.

If none of the above alternatives fits your case, please explain._____

_____

_____

Did your adviser: (Item 8a)

___Try to sell you on his field of study.

___Encourage you to enter his field of study.

___Discourage you from entering his field.

___Encourage you to delay a final decision on choice of major.

If none of the above alternatives fits your case, please explain._____

_____

Would you say your adviser: (Item 9)

___Increased your understanding of curriculum matters and enrollment procedures.

___Did not provide much information which I had not already gotten from another source.

___Needlessly made things appear to be more complicated than they are.

If none of the above alternatives fits your case, please explain._____

_____

_____

_____

Do you think your adviser: (Item 10)

___is very interested in advising and helping freshman students.

___is somewhat interested in advising and helping freshman students.

___is not particularly interested in advising and helping freshmen.

___dislikes having to advise freshmen.

If none of the above is descriptive of your adviser, please explain.___

_____

_____

Did your adviser discuss general university requirements with you? (Item 11)

____Yes

____No

Did your adviser give you any advice on how to get through registration? (Item 12)

____Yes

____No

If yes, please expalin._____

_____

Did your adviser answer all of your questions for you? (Item 13)

____Yes

____No

If not, did he send you to someone who could answer your questions? (Item 13a)

____Yes

____No

For each of the set of circumstances listed below, indicate the likelihood that you would contact your adviser for help or information.

1. I definitely would see my adviser
2. I probably would see my adviser.
3. I might see my adviser if no one else could help.
4. I definitely would not see my adviser.

____You need to change your class schedule. (Item 14)

____You are having a personality conflict with one of your instructors. (Item 15)

____You are having academic problems in one or more classes. (Item 16)

____You are having emotional problems that interfere with your schoolwork. (Item 17)

____A friend of yours has a serious drug problem. (Item 18)

When you left your individual advising session, did you feel: (Item 19)

____more confident in your role as a student.

____no different than before the advising session.

____less confident in your role as a student.

If none of the above alternatives fits your case, please explain._____

_____

_____

Please use the space below to make any further comments you might have concerning advising.

APPENDIX B

Interview Schedule

The purpose of our interviews is to find out more about the advising process. We are contacting freshman students at random to come in and talk to us about curriculum advising so that advisers will be able to do a better job of advising. Past research has indicated that mailing out questionnaires is not an effective means of gathering the information we need, so we are conducting interviews, which we are tape recording, to gain the needed information. We are recording the answers because we have found that this interferes less with the spontaneity of the interview than do any other means of recording answers. You will be indentified on tape by number only and any information which you give us will be strictly confidential.

The information we are gathering is in the interest of students and will be used in the interest of students. So please be as candid as possible in the answers you give, and feel free to elaborate on your answers. I would like to caution you not to identify your adviser by name. Our interest is in how advisers act and what they do--not in who they are.

Are there any questions before we begin?

1. First of all, we would like your views on <u>what the role</u> of an adviser <u>should be</u>. How should an adviser behave and what services should be provided for the student?

   (If responses are brief, ask the student to elaborate. If he mentions only behaviors or services, ask him to discuss the area not mentioned.)

2. Now that you have given us some idea of how an adviser should behave, we would like you to describe how your adviser does behave and the relationship between you and your adviser. Remember, please don't mention your adviser's name. Now, tell us <u>what you think</u> of your adviser, and <u>why</u> you see him this way.

   (If answer is too brief, prod the student to elaborate and ask that he say "why" he reacts the way he does.)

3. Next, we would like to know how you think your adviser conceives of <u>his</u> role. In other words, how does your adviser think students should be treated and what services does he think he should provide for his advisees.

4. One final question, how do your friends feel about going to their advisers and the advising process in general?

5. Do you have any other comments you would like to make about your adviser, advising in general, or the advising process?

APPENDIX C[1]

Codes Used to Evaluate Advisee Responses During the Interview

Item 20: Issue Involvement

How important does the individual feel the issue (curriculum advising) is?

1. Uninterested: The individual shows a general lack of interest in the topic and fails to express concern over possible decisions on the issue.

   Example: The individual volunteers that he has little interest in the topic and needs to be prodded to get more than minimal answers.

2. Aware: The individual recognizes that there is a possibility of changing the present system and displays some interest in disucssing the issue. He expresses some concern over possible changes willingly expresses his own opinion, and probably has some idea of his friends position on the issue.

3. Very interested: The individual voluntarily labels the issue an important one. He freely elaborates on his views.

   Example: The individual stresses the importance of the issue and relates the issue to his own experiences at the beginning of the interview. He expresses concern about possible decisions might effect the advising system. He may show greater than average knowledge of the system and use emotionally laden terms in discussing. Will probably relate to other aspects of the environment.

8. Other: The individual does not seem to belong anywhere in the above set of categories.

9. Not appropriate

---

[1]The format for the codes above is based on that used by the Survey Research Center in its coding manual.

Item 21: Position Involvement - Advising

How strongly does the individual hold to his position?

1. **Low:** The individual expresses voluntarily that he doesn't particularly have any opinion about his adviser. He probably qualifies his answers throughout the interview.

2. **Open:** The individual indicates a like or dislike for his adviser, but recognizes that others might not hold his view, i.e., recognizes that his adviser might be a good (bad) adviser for some students.

3. **Mixed:** The individual expresses mixed feelings concerning his adviser. Descriptions of the adviser will be good and bad and the student may appear to contradict himself.

4. **Closed:** The individual expresses a definite like or dislike for his adviser and is sure that other students will (do) feel the same way.

8. **Other:**

9. **Not appropriate**

Item 22: Position Involvement - Advising

How strongly does the individual hold to his position?

1. **Low:** The individual expresses voluntarily that he does not have any interest in the advising process nor does he care how the program is run.

2. **Open:** The individual indicates a preferred approach to the advising process while recognizing that different students might do better under other approaches.

3. **Mixed Open:** The individual expresses a preference for two or more approaches or systems and recognizes that yet other systems or approaches might be workable.

4. **Mixed Closed:** The individual indicates that only two alternatives are satisfactory to his point of view - he does not see any others as being acceptable.

5. **Closed:** The individual expresses a definite preference for one system or approach and cites reasons in support that alternative. He does not mention other alternatives as workable.

8. **Other:**

9. **Not Appropriate:**

Item 23: Situational Involvement

In interview situation not synonymous with uneasiness.

1. Low: The individual is generally unresponsive to questions asked and does not seem to be nervous.

   Example: The individual comes in and seems comfortable in the interview situation. He does not seem to be concerned with pleasing or displeasing the interviewer. Needs prompting.

2. Medium: The individual is generally responsive to questions, may seem a little nervous and show hesitation.

   Example: The individual responds to questions, will begin to respond again after brief periods of silence or his response rate increases following hums from the interviewer. Mild prompting.

3. High: The individual takes the interview situation very seriously and seems to want to please the interviewer.

   Example: He may try to elicit the interviewer's opinion, enhance his own position in the interviewer's eyes, or elicit agreement from the interviewer. Involved in the situation of being interviewed.

8. Other:

9. Not Appropriate:

Item 24: Attitude Position - Advising

How does the student feel about the advising process?

1. Strongly Against: The individual flatly states that he thinks there is no need for assigned advisers and does not express any doubts concerning his position.

2. Against With Minor Reservations: The individual states that he is against assigned advisers but allows that there may be merits in the system for some people.

3. Against With Major Reservations: The individual seems to be generally against the advising system but expresses a great deal of doubt about the validity of his own position and may express an understanding of the position advocated by those who favor the system.

4. Neutral: The individual does not seem to lean either way. He may seem confused about the advising system and about why anyone is concerned about the system.

5. For With Major Reservations: The individual states that he thinks advising is a good idea but thinks that it is unnecessary for some students. He may suggest a voluntary system.

6. For With Minor Reservations: The individual states that he favors the advising system but sees room for changes in the system. He will probably treat suggested changes as possibilities which may or may not work out in the long run.

7. Strongly For: The individual states that the advising system is a "good deal" and feels that it benefits all students. He may suggest minor changes in the system but still sees the advising system as necessary.

8. Other:

9. Not Appropriate:

Item 25: Attitude Position - The Adviser

How does the student feel about his adviser?

1. Strongly Against: The student openly expresses a dislike for his adviser. May express a desire to change adviser and does not question his evaluation.

2. Against With Minor Reservations: The individual expresses dislike for his adviser but hedges. May begrudge the adviser one or two points but basically does like the adviser.

3. Against With Major Reservations: The individual doesn't seem to care for his adviser and may say so. He probably recognizes that the adviser may have some good points to go along with the bad. May admit the adviser might be seen as a good adviser by others.

4. Neutral: The individual does not seem to lean either way. He may take the position that "an adviser is an adviser" he does what he has to and it is no big deal one way or the other.

5. For With Major Reservations: The individual may express a liking for or acceptance of the adviser but openly states that the adviser did not meet expectations. The student may express a positive affect accompanied by negative content.

6. For With Minor Reservations: The individual states that he likes his adviser or the adviser is competent but hedges. May point to irritating personal characteristics or suggest specific changes in the adviser's approach but gives an over-all positive evaluation.

7. Strongly For: The individual whole-heartedly endorses his adviser. Probably expresses admiration and liking for the adviser.

8. Other:

9. Not Appropriate:

Item 26: Characterization of the Ideal Adviser

1. Counselor: The individual feels that the "Ideal Adviser" is an all-knowing counselor who can administer therapy if needed and who will watch over and take care of the advisee.

2. Concerned Friend: The individual feels the adviser should be sympathetic to his needs and problems and should serve (mainly) as a source of information and counsel in curriculum matters.

3. Administrator: The individual feels that advising is limited to curriculum matters. He may see advising as a faculty duty. He expects the adviser to give him information when he asks for it and to otherwise leave him (the advisee) alone.

4. Non-entity: The individual sees the ideal as the adviser who gives the student his advising number and tells him to do whatever he wants to do.

8. Other:

9. Not Appropriate:

Item 27: Characterization of the Actual Adviser

(Categories the same as those for Item 26)

1. Counselor: The individual feels that the "Ideal Adviser" is an all-knowing counselor who can administer therapy if needed and who will watch over and take care of the advisee.

2. Concerned Friend: The individual feels the adviser should be sympathetic to his needs and problems and should serve (mainly) as a source of information and counsel in curriculum matters.

3. Administrator: The individual feels that advising is limited to curriculum matters. He may see advising as a faculty duty. He expects the adviser to give him information when he asks for it and to otherwise leave him (the advisee) alone.

4. Non-entity: The individual sees the ideal as the adviser who gives the student his advising number and tells him to do whatever he wants to do.

8. Other:

9. Not Appropriate:

APPENDIX D

Stepwise Regression for Difference between Obtained and Predicted GPA[1]

Item	Description	Correlation with Dependent Variable	Multiple Regression	Significance Level for Multiple Regression ($p < .05$)	Significance Level for Additional Variance accounted for ($p < .05$)
14	See adviser for schedule change	.144	.1440	*	*
15	See adviser for instructor conflict	-.110	.2220	*	*
8	Adviser's attitude, friendliness	.137	.2595	*	NS
2	Adviser's sex	.081	.2803	*	NS
30	Type of adviser, SA vs. FA	-.080	.2909	*	NS
3	Know location of adviser's office	-.074	.3048	*	NS
1	Advisee's sex	-.025	.3121	*	NS

[1]Variables not included contribute .01 or less to the multiple regression.

APPENDIX E

Summary of Responses to Questionnaire: Percent of Student Advised (SA) vs. Percent of Faculty Advised (FA).

This appendix summarizes the questionnaire data comparing SAs and FAs. Below each item is the data breakdown used for purposes of X^2 analysis when collapsing was necessary, the obtained X^2 value, the degrees of freedom associated with the X^2 value, and, in those cases where the probability of the X^2 value is .05 or less, a statement of the probability. Collapsing of the X^2 matrixes was done on the basis of the original five adviser categories, always involved collapsing adjacent categories, or dropping categories, and generally involved the collapsing of the fewest number of categories possible to meet cell frequency assumptions for X^2 analyses. (Number of respondents is indicated in parenthesis.)

Item 1 - Sex of Advisee

	% SA		% FA	
Male	46.0	(33)	54.0	(80)
Female	54.0	(39)	46.0	(69)
Total	100.0		100.0	

X^2 1.000, df = 1

Item 2 - Sex of Adviser

	% SA		% FA	
Male	33.0	(24)	74.0	(110)
Female	67.0	(48)	26.0	(39)
Total	100.0		100.0	

$X^2 = 19.306$, df = 1, $p < .05$

Item 3 - The location of my adviser's office is_____

	% SA		% FA	
Could list	82.0	(59)	97.0	(145)
Could not list	18.0	(13)	3.0	(4)
Total	100.0		100.0	

$X^2 = 16.155$, df = 1, $p < .05$

Item 4 - I have had ____ curriculum advising contacts with my adviser.

	% SA		% FA	
0 or 1	24.0	(17)	36.5	(54)
2 or 3	59.0	(42)	54.0	(80)
4 or more	17.0	(12)	9.5	(14)
Total	100.0		100.0	

X^2 = 4.790, df = 2

Item 5 - Have you had any informal visits with your adviser?

	% SA		% FA	
Yes	33.0	(24)	28.5	(42)
No	67.0	(48)	71.5	(106)
Total	100.0		100.0	

X^2 1.000, df = 1

Item 6 - In planning your fall schedule, would you say:

	% SA		% FA	
My adviser planned my schedule for me	5.5	(4)	6.5	(9)
I discussed my schedule with my adviser and he talked me into taking the courses that I enrolled in	10.0	(7)	11.0	(15)
I discussed my schedule with my adviser but he left the final decisions up to me	71.5	(50)	50.0	(69)
My adviser expected me to plan my own schedule	13.0	(9)	32.5	(45)
Total	100.0		100.0	

X^2 = 10.779, df = 3, $p < .05$

Item 7 - If I need to get in touch with my adviser:

	% SA		% FA	
I know when and where to find him	62.5	(43)	36.0	(51)
I can get in touch with him if I make an appointment	16.0	(11)	30.0	(42)
I can reach him after two or three attempts	14.5	(10)	20.5	(29)
I find it almost impossible to get hold of him	7.0	(5)	13.5	(19)
Total	100.0		100.0	

$X^2 = 12.396$, df = 3, $p < .05$

Item 8 - In your individual advising session, would you say your adviser was:

	% SA		% FA	
Very friendly	46.0	(43)	33.5	(47)
Friendly	37.5	(27)	39.5	(56)
Neither particularly friendly or unfriendly	16.5	(12)	25.5	(36)
unfriendly or distant	00.0	(0)	1.5	(2)
Very unfriendly or distant	00.0	(0)	00.0	(0)
Total	100.0		100.0	

$X^2 = 4.191$, df = 2 (X^2 based on 1st 3 response categories only)

Item 8a - Did your adviser:

	% SA	% FA
Try to sell you on his field of study	*	*
Encourage you to enter his field of study	*	*
Discourage you from entering his field	*	*
Encourage you to delay a final decision on choice of major	*	*

*Most students could not describe their advisers as falling in any of these categories and thus responses to this item were not analyzed.

Item 9 - Would you say your adviser:

	% SA		% FA	
Increased your understanding of curriculum matters and enrollment procedures	53.0	(38)	33.5	(48)
Did not provide much information which I had not already gotten from other sources	43.0	(31)	61.0	(88)
Needlessly made things appear to be more complicated than they are	4.0	(3)	5.5	(8)
Total	100.0		100.0	

X^2 - 7.347, df = 1, p $<$ .05 (X^2 based on 1st 2 response categories only)

Item 10 - Do you think your adviser:

	% SA		% FA	
Is very interested in advising and helping Freshman students	3.0	(2)	1.5	(2)
Is somewhat interested in advising and helping Freshman students	18.5	(13)	38.0	(53)
Is not particularly interested in advising and helping Freshmen	37.0	(26)	35.5	(50)
Dislikes having to advise Freshmen	41.5	(29)	25.0	(35)
Total	100.0		100.0	

X^2 = 8.624, df = 2, p $<$ .05

Item 11 - Did your adviser discuss general university requirements with you?

	% SA		% FA	
Yes	25.0	(18)	39.0	(57)
No	75.0	(53)	61.0	(89)
Total	100.0		100.0	

X^2 = 3.377, df = 1

Item 12 - Did your adviser give you any advice on how to get through registration?

	% SA		% FA	
No	41.0	(29)	72.0	(105)
Yes	59.0	(42)	28.0	(41)
Total	100.0		100.0	

$X^2 = 19.518$, df = 1, $p < .05$

Item 13 - Did your adviser answer all of your questions for you?

	% SA		% FA	
No	22.0	(16)	32.5	(47)
Yes	78.0	(56)	67.5	(98)
Total	100.0		100.0	

$X^2 = 2.420$, df = 1

Item 13a - If not, did he send you to someone who could answer your questions?

	% SA	% FA
Yes	*	*
No	*	*

Yes alternative was used only 5 times. These were treated as yes answers to Item 13 and this data discarded.

Item 14 - You need to change your class schedule.

	% SA		% FA	
I definitely would see my adviser	29.5	(21)	27.5	(41)
I probably would see my adviser	27.0	(19)	23.5	(35)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	39.5	(28)	41.5	(62)
I definitely would not see my adviser	4.0	(3)	7.5	(11)
Total	100.0		100.0	

$X^2 = .569$, df = 2 (X^2 based on collapsing 3rd and 4th categories)

Item 15 - You are having a personality conflict with one of your instructors.

	% SA		% FA	
I definitely would see my adviser	10.0	(7)	9.5	(14)
I probably would see my adviser	18.0	(13)	21.5	(32)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	38.0	(27)	47.0	(70)
I definitely would not see my adviser	34.0	(24)	22.0	(33)
Total	100.0		100.0	

X^2 = 3.506, df = 2 (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 2 categories)

Item 16 - You are having academic problems in one or more classes.

	% SA		% FA	
I definitely would see my adviser	19.5	(14)	18.0	(27)
I probably would see my adviser	21.0	(15)	28.0	(42)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	45.0	(32)	34.0	(51)
I definitely would not see my adviser	14.0	(10)	19.5	(29)
Total	99.5		99.5	

X^2 = .382, df = 1 (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 2 vs. 2nd 2 categories)

Item 17 - You are having emotional problems that interfere with your schoolwork.

	% SA		% FA	
I definitely would see my adviser	4.0	(3)	5.5	(8)
I probably would see my adviser	5.5	(4)	9.5	(14)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	29.5	(21)	24.0	(36)
I definitely would not see my adviser	60.5	(43)	61.0	(91)
Total	99.5		100.0	

X^2 = 1.424, df = 2 (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 2 categories)

Item 18 - A friend of yours has a serious drug problem.

	% SA		% FA	
I definitely would see my adviser	1.5	(1)	2.0	(3)
I probably would see my adviser	4.0	(3)	3.5	(5)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	12.5	(9)	16.0	(24)
I definitely would not see my adviser	81.5	(58)	78.5	(117)
Total	99.5		100.0	

X^2 = .445, df = 3

Item 19 - When you left your individual advising session, did you feel

	% SA		% FA	
More confident in your role as a student	55.0	(39)	44.0	(63)
No different than before the advising session	39.5	(28)	44.5	(64)
Less confident in your role as a student	5.5	(4)	12.0	(17)
Total	100.0		100.5	

X^2 = 2.100, df = 2

APPENDIX F

Summary of Responses to Questionnaire: Percent of Student Advised (SA) vs. Percent of Faculty Advised (FA).

This appendix summarizes the coding data comparing SAs and FAs. Below each item is the data breakdown used for purposes of X^2 analysis when collapsing was necessary, the obtained X^2 value, the degrees of freedom associated with the X^2 value, and, in those cases where the probability of the X^2 value is .05 or less, a statement of the probability. Collapsing of the X^2 matrixes was done on the basis of the original five adviser categories, always involved collapsing adjacent categories, or dropping categories, and generally involved the collapsing of the fewest number of categories possible to meet cell frequency assumptions for X^2 analyses.

Item 20 - Issue Involvement

How important does the individual feel the issue (Curriculum Advising) is?

	% SA		% SA	
Uninterested	3.0	(2)	8.0	(12)
Aware	90.0	(65)	80.5	(119)
Very Interested	7.0	(5)	11.5	(17)
Total	100.0		100.0	

$X^2 = 3.727$, df = 2

Item 21 - Position Involvement - Adviser

How strongly does the individual hold to his position? (like-dislike)

	% SA		% FA	
Low	5.5	(4)	2.0	(3)
Open	8.0	(6)	6.5	(9)
Mixed	28.0	(20)	45.5	(64)
Closed	58.5	(42)	45.5	(64)
Total	100.0		99.5	

$X^2 = 6.669$, df = 2, $p < .05$ (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 2 categories)

Item 22 - Position Involvement - Advising System

In terms of position taken regarding present system -- how strongly does the individual hold to that position?

	% SA		% FA	
Low	3.0	(2)	2.5	(4)
Open	9.5	(7)	16.5	(24)
Mixed Open	26.5	(19)	20.0	(29)
Mixed Closed	16.5	(12)	26.5	(39)
Closed	44.5	(32)	34.0	(50)
Total	100.0		99.5	

$X^2 = 5.448$, df = 3 (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 2 categories)

Item 23 - Situational Involvement

In interview situation not synonymous with uneasiness

	% SA		% FA	
Low	0.0	(0)	1.5	(2)
Medium	84.5	(61)	82.5	(122)
High	15.5	(11)	16.0	(24)
Total	100.0		100.0	

$X^2 = .032$, df = 1 (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 2 categories)

Item 24 - Attitude Position - Advising

How does the student feel about the advising process?

	% SA		% FA	
Strongly against	0.0	(0)	3.5	(5)
Against with minor reservations	4.0	(3)	7.0	(10)
Against with major reservations	4.0	(3)	14.5	(21)
Neutral	1.5	(1)	7.5	(11)
For with major reservations	32.0	(23)	19.0	(28)
For with minor reservations	43.0	(31)	41.0	(60)
Strongly for	15.5	(11)	8.0	(12)
Total	100.0		100.5	

X^2 = 13.810, df = 2, $p < .05$ (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 4 and last 2 categories)

Item 25 - Attitude Position - the adviser

How does the student feel about his adviser?

	% SA		% FA	
Strongly against	7.0	(5)	10.5	(15)
Against with minor reservations	8.5	(6)	11.5	(16)
Against with major reservations	5.5	(4)	14.5	(20)
Neutral	4.0	(3)	1.5	(2)
For with major reservations	14.0	(10)	13.5	(19)
For with minor reservations	21.0	(15)	2.5	(35)
Strongly for	40.5	(29)	23.5	(33)
Total	100.5		77.5	

X^2 = 7.184, df = 3 (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 4 categories)

Item 26 - Characterization of the Ideal Adviser

	% SA		% FA	
Counselor	4.0	(3)	9.0	(13)
Concerned friend	78.0	(56)	75.0	(110)
Administrator	18.0	(13)	16.5	(24)
Non-entity	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)
Total	100.0		100.5	

$X^2 = 1.569$, df = 2

Item 27 - Characterization of the Actual Adviser

Which of these types fits the advisee's description of his/her adviser?

	% SA		% FA	
Counselor	5.5	(4)	4.5	(6)
Sympathetic Adviser	69.5	(50)	40.5	(56)
Administrator	16.5	(12)	29.5	(41)
Formality	8.5	(6)	26.0	(36)
Total	100.0		100.5	

$X^2 = 18.639$, df = 3, $p < .05$

APPENDIX G

Summary of Responses to Questionnaire: Percent Responding in Each Category as a Function of Attitude Toward Adviser

This appendix summarizes questionnaire data as it relates to Item 25 (liking for the adviser). Below each item is the data breakdown used for purposes of X^2 analysis when collapsing was necessary, the obtained X^2 value, the degrees of freedom associated with the X^2 value, and, in those cases where the probability of the X^2 value is .05 or less, a statement of the probability. Collapsing of the X^2 matrixes always involved collapsing adjacent categories, or dropping categories, and generally involved the collapsing of the fewest number of categories possible to meet cell frequency assumptions for X^2 analyses.

Distribution of responses as a function of evaluation of adviser:

1. Strongly against
2. Against with minor reservations
3. Against with major reservations
4. Neutral
5. For with major reservations
6. For with minor reservations
7. Strongly for

Item 1 - Sex of Advisee

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Male	35.0 (7)	45.5 (10)	37.5 (9)	40.0 (2)	41.5 (12)	66.0 (33)	54.0 (33)
Female	65.0 (13)	54.5 (12)	62.5 (15)	60.0 (3)	58.5 (17)	34.0 (17)	46.0 (28)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 10.069$, $df = 6$

Item 2 - Sex of Adviser

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Male	60.0 (12)	68.0 (15)	75.0 (18)	60.0 (3)	55.0 (16)	62.0 (31)	52.5 (32)
Female	40.0 (8)	32.0 (7)	25.0 (6)	40.0 (2)	45.0 (13)	38.0 (19)	47.5 (29)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 4.678$, df = 6

Item 3 - The location of my adviser's office is _____

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No	0.0 (0)	8.5 (2)	16.5 (4)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (3)	4.0 (2)	6.5 (4)
Yes	100.0 (20)	91.5 (20)	83.5 (20)	100.0 (5)	89.5 (26)	96.0 (48)	93.5 (57)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Too few "no" responses for analysis

Item 4 - I have had _____curriculum advising contacts with my adviser.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0 and 1	50.0 (10)	41.0 (9)	37.5 (9)	60.0 (3)	32.0 (7)	20.5 (10)	23.5 (14)
2 or more	50.0 (10)	59.0 (13)	62.5 (15)	40.0 (2)	68.0 (22)	79.5 (39)	76.5 (46)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 7.686$, df = 1, $p < .05$ (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 4 vs. last 3 on Item 25 (liking) dimension)

Item 5 - Have you had any informal visits with your adviser?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No	90.0 (18)	82.0 (18)	79.0 (19)	40.0 (2)	79.5 (23)	66.0 (33)	55.0 (33)
Yes	10.0 (2)	18.0 (4)	21.0 (5)	60.0 (3)	20.5 (6)	34.0 (17)	45.0 (27)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 16.214$, df = 6, $p < .05$

Item 6 - In planning your fall schedule, would you say:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My adviser planned my schedule for me	11.0 (2)	10.0 (2)	8.5 (2)	0.0 (0)	7.0 (2)	2.5 (1)	6.5 (4)
I discussed my schedule with my adviser and he talked me into taking the courses that I enrolled in	5.5 (1)	20.0 (4)	12.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (7)	0.0 (0)	11.5 (7)
I discussed my schedule with my adviser but he left the final decisions up to me	28.0 (5)	10.0 (2)	41.5 (10)	40.0 (2)	53.5 (15)	77.5 (38)	73.5 (44)
My adviser expected me to plan my own schedule	55.5 (10)	60.0 (12)	37.5 (9)	60.0 (3)	14.5 (4)	20.5 (10)	8.5 (5)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.5	100.0

X^2 - 62.103, df = 18, p <105

Item 7 - If I need to get in touch with my adviser:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I know when and where to find him	16.0 (3)	25.0 (5)	29.0 (7)	80.0 (4)	33.5 (9)	38.5 (18)	74.0 (45)
I can get in touch with him if I make an appointment	26.5 (5)	30.0 (6)	21.0 (5)	0.0 (0)	29.5 (8)	34.0 (16)	16.5 (10)
I can reach him after two or three attempts	21.0 (4)	20.0 (4)	25.0 (6)	20.0 (1)	26.0 (7)	25.5 (12)	8.0 (5)
I find it almost impossible to get hold of him	37.0 (7)	25.0 (5)	25.0 (6)	0.0 (0)	11.0 (3)	2.0 (1)	1.5 (1)
Total	100.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$\underline{X}^2 = 44.957$, $\underline{df} = 12$, $\underline{p} < .05$ (X^2 based on collapsing 3rd and 4th of Item 7

Item 8 - In your individual advising session, would you say your adviser was:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very friendly	5.0 (10	4.5 (1)	16.5 (4)	20.0 (1)	34.5 (10)	40.0 (20)	68.0 (41)
Friendly	15.0 (3)	36.5 (8)	48.5 (14)	80.0 (4)	48.5 (14)	44.0 (22)	28.0 (17)
Neither particularly friendly or unfriendly	70.0 (14)	59.0 (13)	25.0 (6)	0.0 (0)	17.0 (5)	16.0 (8)	3.0 (2)
Unfriendly or distant	10.0 (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very unfriendly or distant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.0

$X^2 = 92.627$, df = 12, $p < .05$ (Does not include 4th and 5th response categories for Item 8)

Item 8a - Did your adviser:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Try to sell you on his field of study	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Encourage you to enter his field of study	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Discourage you from entering his field	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Encourage you to delay a final decision on choice of major	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

*Most students could not describe their advisers as falling in any of these categories and thus responses to this item were not analyzed.

Item 9 - Did you say your adviser:

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
Increased your understanding of curriculum matters and enrollment procedures	0.0	(0)	4.5	(1)	12.0	(3)	20.0	(1)	20.5	(6)	46.0	(23)	81.5	(49)
Did not provide much information which I had not already gotten from other sources	75.0	(15)	86.5	(19)	79.0	(19)	80.0	(4)	72.5	(21)	54.0	(27)	19.5	(12)
Needlessly made things appear to be more complicated than they are	25.0	(5)	9.0	(2)	8.0	(2)	0.0	(0)	7.0	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)
Total	100.0		100.0		99.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0	

$\underline{X}^2 = 80.267$, $\underline{df} = 6$, $\underline{p} < .05$

Item 10 - Do you think your adviser:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is very interested in advising and helping freshman students	5.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	8.5 (2)	25.0 (1)	11.0 (3)	34.5 (17)	62.0 (38)
Is somewhat interested in advising and helping freshman students	20.0 (4)	32.0 (7)	33.5 (8)	75.0 (3)	44.5 (12)	43.0 (21)	33.0 (20)
Is not particularly interested in advising and helping freshmen	60.0 (12)	63.5 (14)	58.5 (14)	0.0 (0)	44.5 (12)	22.5 (11)	5.0 (3)
Dislikes having to advise freshmen	15.0 (3)	4.5 (1)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

X^2 - 62.209, df = 6, p <.05 (X^2 based on collapsing 1st and 2nd vs. 3rd and 4th categories of Item 10)

Item 11 - Did your adviser discuss general university requirements with you?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Yes	35.0 (7)	41.0 (9)	50.0 (12)	60.0 (3)	65.5 (19)	67.5 (33)	92.0 (56)
No	65.0 (13)	59.0 (13)	50.0 (12)	40.0 (2)	34.5 (10)	32.5 (16)	8.0 (5)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 22.830$, df = 1, $p < .05$

Item 12 - Did your adviser give you any advice on how to get through registration?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Yes	10.0 (2)	9.0 (2)	12.5 (3)	40.0 (2)	38.0 (11)	36.0 (17)	70.5 (43)
No	90.0 (18)	91.0 (20)	87.5 (21)	60.0 (3)	62.0 (18)	64.0 (32)	29.5 (18)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 27.785$, df = 1, $p < .05$

Item 13 - Did your adviser answer all of your questions for you?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Yes	35.0 (7)	52.5 (11)	71.0 (17)	60.0 (3)	65.5 (19)	74.0 (37)	93.5 (57)
No	65.0 (13)	47.5 (10)	29.0 (7)	40.0 (2)	34.5 (10)	26.0 (13)	6.5 (4)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 14.853$, df = 1, $p < .05$

Item 13a - If not, did he send you to someone who could answer your questions?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Too few responses to analyze. (Yes answers treated as yes on Item 13.)

Item 14 - You need to change your class schedule:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I definitely would see my adviser	10.0 (2)	9.0 (2)	25.0 (6)	0.0 (0)	18.0 (5)	24.0 (12)	54.0 (33)
I probably would see my adviser	15.0 (3)	13.5 (3)	16.5 (4)	20.0 (1)	35.5 (10)	24.0 (12)	29.5 (18)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	60.0 (12)	68.0 (15)	50.0 (12)	80.0 (4)	43.0 (12)	44.0 (22)	15.0 (9)
I definitely would not see my adviser	15.0 (3)	9.0 (2)	8.5 (2)	0.0 (0)	3.5 (1)	8.0 (4)	1.5 (1)
Total	100.0	99.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 47.766$, $df = 6$, $p < .05$ (X^2 based on collapsing 1st and 2nd vs. 2nd and 3rd categories of Item 14)

Item 15 - You are having a personality conflict with one of your instructors:

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
I definitely would see my adviser	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	8.5	(2)	0.0	(0)	3.5	(1)	12.0	(6)	18.0	(11)
I probably would see my adviser	20.0	(4)	9.0	(2)	21.0	(5)	20.0	(1)	18.0	(5)	18.0	(9)	23.0	(14)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	25.0	(5)	36.5	(8)	41.5	(10)	20.0	(1)	68.0	(19)	46.0	(23)	47.5	(29)
I definitely would not see my adviser	55.0	(11)	54.5	(12)	29.0	(7)	60.0	(3)	10.5	(3)	24.0	(12)	11.5	(7)
Total	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0	

$\underline{X}^2 = 9.640$, $\underline{df} = 6$ (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 2 and 2nd 2 categories of Item 15)

Item 16 - You are having academic problems in one or more classes:

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
I definitely would see my adviser	0.0	(0)	9.0	(2)	8.5	(2)	0.0	(0)	10.5	(3)	14.0	(7)	39.5	(24)
I probably would see my adviser	15.0	(3)	22.5	(5)	29.0	(7)	0.0	(0)	39.5	(11)	26.0	(13)	23.0	(14)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	45.0	(9)	41.0	(9)	54.0	(13)	40.0	(2)	35.5	(10)	32.0	(16)	34.5	(2)
I definitely would not see my adviser	40.0	(8)	27.5	(6)	8.5	(2)	60.0	(3)	14.5	(4)	28.0	(14)	3.5	(2)
Total	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.5	

$X^2 = 37.045$, df = 12, p $< .05$ (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 2 categories of Item 16)

Item 17 - You are having emotional problems that interfere with your schoolwork:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I definitely would see my adviser	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.0 (3)	10.0 (6)
I probably would see my adviser	5.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	8.5 (2)	20.0 (1)	7.0 (2)	6.0 (3)	13.0 (8)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	15.0 (3)	18.0 (4)	8.5 (2)	0.0 (0)	25.0 (7)	34.0 (17)	37.5 (23)
I definitely would not see my adviser	80.0 (16)	82.0 (18)	83.5 (20)	80.0 (4)	68.0 (19)	54.0 (27)	39.5 (24)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 26.428$, $df = 6$, $p < .05$ (X^2 based on collapsing 1st 2 vs. 2nd 2 categories of Item 17)

Item 18 - A friend of yours has a serious drug problem:

I definitely would see my adviser	0.0	(0)	4.5	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	4.0	(2)	0.0	(0)
I probably would see my adviser	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	4.0	(1)	0.0	(0)	3.5	(10)	2.0	(1)	8.0	(5)
I might see my adviser if no one else could help	5.0	(1)	4.5	(1)	12.5	(3)	0.0	(0)	18.0	(5)	12.0	(6)	26.0	(16)
I definitely would not see my adviser	95.0	(19)	91.0	(20)	83.5	(20)	100.0	(5)	78.5	(22)	82.0	(41)	65.5	(40)
Total	100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		100.0		99.5	

$X^2 = 13.689$, df = 6, $p < .05$ (X^2 based on 1st 2 vs. 2nd 2 categories of Item 18)

Item 19 - When you left your individual advising session, did you feel:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
More confident in your role as a student	5.0 (1)	18.0 (4)	25.0 (6)	60.0 (3)	39.5 (11)	50.0 (25)	82.0 (50)
No different than before the advising session	50.0 (10)	63.5 (14)	66.5 (16)	40.0 (2)	50.0 (14)	50.0 (25)	15.0 (9)
Less confident in your role as a student	45.0 (9)	18.0 (4)	8.5 (2)	0.0 (0)	10.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	3.5 (2)
Total	100.0	99.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.5

$X^2 = 57.182$, df = 6, $p < .05$ (X^2 based on collapsing of 2nd and 3rd categories of Item 19)

Item 30 - Classification of adviser:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SA	25.0 (5)	27.5 (6)	16.5 (4)	60.0 (3)	34.5 (10)	30.0 (15)	47.0 (29)
FA	75.0 (15)	72.5 (16)	83.5 (20)	40.0 (2)	65.5 (19)	70.0 (35)	53.0 (33)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 10.922$, df = 6

APPENDIX H

Summary of Responses to Questionnaire: Percent Responding in Each Category as a Function of Attitude Toward Adviser

This appendix summarizes questionnaire data as it relates to Item 25 (liking for the adviser). Below each item is the data breakdown used for purposes of X^2 analysis when collapsing was necessary, the obtained X^2 value, the degrees of freedom associated with the X^2 value, and, in those cases where the probability of the X^2 value is .05 or less, a statement of the probability. Collapsing of the X^2 matrixes always involved collapsing adjacent categories, or dropping categories, and generally involved the collapsing of the fewest number of categories possible to meet cell frequency assumptions for X^2 analyses.

Item 20 - Issue Involvement

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Uninterested	5.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.0 (7)	6.5 (4)
Aware	55.0 (11)	91.0 (20)	83.5 (20)	100.0 (5)	86.0 (25)	84.0 (42)	90.5 (56)
Very Interested	40.0 (8)	9.0 (2)	16.5 (4)	0.0 (0)	14.0 (4)	2.0 (1)	3.0 (2)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Failed to meet X^2 assumptions.

Item 21 - Position Involvement - Adviser

How strongly does the individual hold to his position? (like-dislike)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	4.0 (1)	40.0 (2)	3.5 (1)	4.0 (2)	1.5 (1)
Open	5.0 (1)	22.5 (5)	8.5 (2)	0.0 (0)	3.5 (1)	10.0 (5)	1.5 (1)
Mixed	15.0 (3)	32.0 (7)	83.5 (20)	40.0 (2)	93.0 (27)	46.0 (23)	3.0 (2)
Closed	80.0 (16)	45.5 (10)	4.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	40.0 (20)	93.5 (58)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.5

$X^2 = 125.680$, $df = 12$, $p < .05$

Item 22 - Position Involvement - Advising System

In terms of position taken regarding present system - how strongly does the individual hold to that position?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	20.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	6.0 (3)	1.5 (1)
Open	10.0 (2)	13.5 (3)	17.5 (4)	20.0 (1)	14.0 (4)	18.5 (9)	13.0 (8)
Mixed Open	35.0 (7)	13.5 (3)	26.0 (6)	0.0 (0)	34.5 (10)	22.5 (11)	13.0 (8)
Mixed Closed	30.0 (6)	22.5 (5)	26.0 (6)	60.0 (3)	31.0 (9)	16.5 (8)	21.0 (13)
Closed	25.0 (5)	50.0 (11)	30.5 (7)	0.0 (0)	20.5 (6)	36.5 (18)	51.5 (32)
Total	100.0	99.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 1.858$, df = 3

Item 23 - Situational Involvement

In interview situation not synonymous with uneasiness

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	3.0 (2)
Medium	85.0 (17)	82.0 (18)	91.5 (18)	100.0 (5)	83.0 (24)	82.0 (41)	79.5 (49)
High	15.0 (3)	18.0 (4)	8.5 (2)	0.0 (0)	17.0 (5)	18.0 (9)	17.5 (11)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Failed to meet X^2 assumption.

Item 24 - Attitude Position - Advising

How does the student feel about the advising process?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly against	5.0 (1)	9.5 (2)	4.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	2.0 (1)	0.0 (0)
Against with minor reservations	20.0 (4)	14.5 (3)	4.0 (1)	20.0 (1)	7.0 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Against with major reservations	20.0 (4)	19.0 (4)	29.0 (7)	20.0 (1)	17.0 (5)	4.0 (2)	1.5 (1)
Neutral	5.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	14.0 (7)	3.0 (2)
For with major reservations	25.0 (5)	33.5 (7)	16.5 (4)	40.0 (2)	27.5 (2)	24.0 (12)	16.0 (10)
For with minor reservations	25.0 (5)	24.0 (5)	41.5 (10)	20.0 (1)	41.5 (12)	48.0 (24)	51.5 (32)
Strongly for	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	7.0 (2)	8.0 (4)	27.5 (17)
Total	100.0	100.5	99.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.5

$X^2 = 29.091$, $df = 12$, $p < .05$

Item 26 - Characterization of the Ideal Adviser

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Counselor	0.0 (0)	9.0 (2)	8.5 (2)	20.0 (1)	3.5 (10	12.0 (6)	6.5 (4)
Concerned friend	95.0 (19)	59.0 (13)	79.0 (19)	80.0 (4)	79.5 (23)	66.0 (33)	80.5 (50)
Administrator	5.0 (1)	32.0 (7)	12.5 (3)	0.0 (0)	17.0 (5)	22.0 (11)	13.0 (8)
Non-entity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Not analyzed due to dominant use of 2nd category.

Item 27 - Characterization of the Actual Adviser

Which of these types fits the advisees description of his/her adviser?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Counselor	5.0 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	3.5 (1)	2.0 (1)	11.5 (7)
Sympathetic Adviser	0.0 (0)	13.5 (3)	21.0 (5)	75.0 (3)	39.5 (11)	66.0 (33)	80.5 (50)
Administrator	30.0 (6)	27.5 (6)	40.0 (12)	0.0 (0)	35.5 (10)	28.0 (14)	8.0 (5)
Formality	65.0 (13)	59.0 (13)	29.0 (7)	25.0 (1)	21.5 (6)	4.0 (2)	0.0 (0)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

$X^2 = 73.397$, $df = 2$, $p < .05$

APPENDIX I

Tabulation of Interviewee Comments

Data presented below represent a tabulation of comments made on tapes by interviewees. Each coder noted comments about the advising system which he felt might provide insight into the system and responses noted by coders only partially overlap. All figures are conservative since the coders did not start tabulating some comments until well into the coding. Only those comments with a frequency of at least ten are reported.

Sense of Comments	% of Tapes	# of Tapes Coded
Advisers should look into student's interests	15	94
System isn't important	28	94
Advising should be strictly curriculum	18	94
Student advisers should be upper classmen	20	223
Will not see adviser again	12	94
Friends do not see advisers	18	94
Advisers should be more directive	13	94
Advisers missed appointments	12	94
Advisers should give vocational guidance	24	223
Should give information about courses and instructors	26	223
System good but some advisers are not	29	94
Didn't have office hours	26	223
Lighter advising load needed	10	223
Advisers should spend more time with advisees	21	223
Should know and explain academic requirements	41	129